D. REMARKS

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification above to include the application serial numbers of the related cross-references.

Claim Status

Claims 1, 2, 5-15, and 18-39 remain. Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 31, and 32 are currently amended. Claims 3, 4, 16, and 17 are cancelled. Claims 40-43 are newly added.

35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Farris et al. (US Patent Number 6,122,327) (hereinafter referred to as Farris). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Furthermore the reference must be an enabling disclosure of each and every element as set forth in the claim. *In re Hoecksma*, 158 USPQ 596, 600 (CCPA 1968); *In re LeGrive*, 133 USPQ 365, 372 (CCPA 1962). Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1, 2, 5-15, and 18-39 in view of the following arguments indicating why Farris does not teach each and every element of claims 1, 2, 5-15, and 18-39.

Claim 1

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner cites Farris as teaching the method of claim 1. [Office Action, p. 2] Applicants respectfully propose that Farris does not anticipate the invention of claim 1 because Farris does not teach or enable expressly or inherently the elements of independent method claim 1. Claim 1 currently reads:

AUS920010847US1   15

PATENT
10/081,017

1.(Original) A method for regulating calls, comprising:

detecting an identity of a caller to a call and an identity of a callee logged in to receive said call;

accessing a selection of third party criteria for regulating a call between said caller identity and said callee identity; and

regulating a communication channel between said caller and said callee according to said selection of third party criteria.

In the objection to claim 1, the Examiner cites Farris, column 11, lines 32-41 and column 35, lines 18-40 as teaching each of the original elements of claim 1. [Office Action, p. 2] In particular, column 11, lines 32-41 read:

"In the preferred system, the IP also performs speaker identification/verification (SIV) on audio signals received from users. Specifically, the IP 23 used for the personalized services includes a voice authentication module to perform the necessary speaker identification/verification function. The IP 23 also includes storage for subscriber specific template or voice feature information, for use in identifying and authenticating subscribers based on speech."

In addition, column 35, lines 18-40 describe the substitution process for substituting the profile for the actual caller using the phone for the line subscriber profile. In particular, column 35, lines 18-40 read:

"This substitution is accomplished. In this case, the profile for child A contains data information which indicates that child A is permitted to accept a call from child C but that child C is required to authenticate herself. The IP is apprised of this requirement and used another prompt to the calling party to

AUS920010847US1   16

PATENT
10/081,017

identify herself. This may be a prompt such as "Who is calling?". A template for the voice of child C is maintained in the IP. This template is now used by the IP to verify that the caller is in fact child C. Child C has now been identified and authenticated as the calling party.

The profile for child A may provide that a distinctive ring signal is to be used corresponding to the identified subscriber or child A. In this event distinctive ringing for child A is used to attempt to have child A answer the telephone. According to the loaded profile for child A, the answering party is prompted to speak her name. The IP remains bridged onto the connection and uses voice processing to verify a match between the spoken response and a template previously installed in the IP. Assuming verification, the switch concludes processing of the call in accord with the loaded profile information, i.e. makes the connection and permits the voice communication to occur. The IP is disconnected."

Thus, Farris describes a system where the caller profile accessed for an identified caller indicates calling rules for that caller, and the rules are based on the identity of the caller and the callee. Farris does not describe a system where a third party may establish criteria for regulating calls based on the identity of a caller and the identity of the callee, without adding that criteria as rules in the caller profile. In particular, Applicants note that a caller profile is associated with the caller, who is a party to the call, and not with a third party who is not a party to the call. In contrast, claim 1 teaches "accessing a selection of third party criteria for regulating a call between said caller identity and said callee identity" and then "regulating a communication channel between said caller and said callee according to said selection of third party criteria." Thus, claim 1 teaches accessing third party criteria for regulating a call, rather than accessing a caller profile with calling rules which is associated with the caller and not a third party, as taught by Farris.

Further, Applicants note that is rejecting claim 1, the Examiner merely refers to passages of the specification of Farris and does not show what portions of the passages teach each and

AUS920010847US1   17

PATENT
10/081,017

every element of claim 1. [see Office Action, p. 2] In particular, Applicants respectfully note that Farris does not expressly or inherently describe "accessing third party criteria" and that the Examiner does not point out how Farris would expressly or inherently describe "accessing third party criteria."

Therefore, because Farris does not teach each and every element of claim 1, and in particular does not teach accessing third party criteria for regulating the call between the caller and the callee or regulating a call according to third party criteria, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Farris. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection against claim 1 and allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2-13

Regarding claims 2-13, Applicants respectfully propose that because Farris does not anticipate independent claim 1 upon which these dependent claims rely, Farris also does not anticipate these dependent claims and the dependent claims should be allowed. Specifically, however, Applicants respectfully propose that even if Farris anticipates independent claim 1, Farris does not anticipate claims 5, 6, and 9

Claims 5 and 6

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the Examiner cites the same portions of Farris as are cited with respect to claim 1, e.g. col. 11, lines 32-41 and col. 35, lines 18-40, as also teach the elements of claims 5 and 6. [Office Action, p. 3] In particular, claims 5 and 6 currently read:

5. (**Currently Amended**) The method for regulating calls according to claim 1, wherein accessing a selection further comprises:

accessing said selection of third party criteria specified by a third party with authority over said caller independent of a caller profile associated with said caller identity.

AUS920010847US1   18

6.   (**Currently Amended**) The method for regulating calls according to claim 1, wherein accessing a selection further comprises:

accessing said selection of third party criteria <u>specified</u> by a third party with authority over said callee <u>independent of a callee profile associated with said callee identity</u>.

Applicants respectfully note, as previously described with reference to claim 1, that the portions of Farris cited by the Examiner, do not teach accessing a selection of third party criteria. In addition, Applicants respectfully note that Farris does not teach accessing a selection of third party criteria by a third party with authority over the caller or callee. In contrast, claims 5 and 6 respectively teach accessing a selection of third party criteria by a third party with authority over the caller or callee. In addition, for purposes of clarification, Applicants note that for purposes of clarification, claims 5 and 6 are amended to indicate that the third party specifies the third party criteria independent of a caller or callee profile associated with caller or callee identities. The specification of the present invention provides antecedent support for the clarification throughout, an in particular, with reference to Figures 5-8, which distinguish between a call context, which includes profile information accessed according to caller and callee identities, and the third party criteria accessed for regulating the call according to the call context. Therefore, because Farris does not teach accessing a selection of third party criteria specified by a third party, where that third party has authority over the caller or callee and the third party criteria is specified independent of a caller or callee profile associated with the caller or callee identity, Farris does not anticipate claims 5 and 6 and claims 5 and 6 should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 and allowance of claims 5 and 6.

AUS920010847US1   19

PATENT
10/081,017

Claim 9

With respect to claim 9, the Examiner cites the same portions of Farris as are cited with respect to claim 1, e.g. col. 11, lines 32-41 and col. 35, lines 18-40, as also teaching the elements of claim 9. [Office Action, p. 4] In particular, claim 9 currently reads:

9.(Original) The method for regulating calls according to claim 1, wherein accessing a selection further comprises:

accessing said selection of third party criteria from a data storage system accessible outside a trusted telephone network processing said call.

Applicants respectfully note that the portions of Farris cited by the Examiner, as cited above, do not teach where a caller profile is accessed from, but merely that a caller profile is accessed that includes instructions for an IP as to how to handle a call. Farris does not teach, nor does the Examiner point to any portion of Farris that teaches, accessing the third party criteria from a data storage system accessible outside a trusted telephone network processing the call. In contrast, claim 9 specifically teaches "accessing said selection of third party criteria for a data storage system accessible outside a trusted telephone network processing said call." In addition, in traversing the rejection, Applicants note that the system described in Figure 1 of Farris, including a data storage system, is taught in Figure 1 of the present invention as being part of the trusted telephone network, which is distinguishable in enablement from servers and data storage system accessing outside the trusted telephone network processing a call (See Figure 1, page 10, line 15 through page 12, line 11 of the present invention). Therefore, because Farris does not teach each and every element, expressly or inherently, of claim 9, Farris does not anticipate claim 9 and Applicants respectfully removal of the rejection and allowance of claim 9.

AUS920010847US1   20

Claims 14-26

The Examiner rejects claims 14-26 for the same reasons set forth in rejecting claims 1-13, since, the Examiner cites that "claims 14-26 are merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claims 1-13, respectively." [Office Action, p. 5] Because the Examiner rejects claims 14-26 for the same reasons set forth in rejection claims 1-13, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 14-26 for the same reasons as Applicants argue for the allowance of claims 1-13. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert, as previously described, that Farris does not anticipate claims 1-13, and therefore, Farris also does not anticipate claims 14-26.

Claims 27-39

The Examiner rejects claims 27-39 for the same reasons set forth in rejecting claims 1-13, since, the Examiner cites that "claims 27-39 are merely a system for implementing the method defined in the method claims 1-13, respectively." [Office Action, p. 5] Applicants note that claims 27-39 actually describe a computer program product, and not a system, for implementing the method defined in the method claims 1-13, respectively. In addition, because the Examiner rejects claims 27-39 for the same reasons set forth in rejection claims 1-13, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 27-39 for the same reasons as Applicants argue for the allowance of claims 1-13. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert, as previously described, that Farris does not anticipate claims 1-13, and therefore, Farris also does not anticipate claims 27-39.

Newly Added

Applicants respectfully request entry and allowance of newly added claims 40-43.

With reference to newly added claim 40, antecedent basis for the elements of "detecting at least one context identifier for said call in addition to said identity of said caller and said identity of said callee, wherein said at least one context identifier comprises at least one from among an identity of a business party called on behalf of by said caller, an identity of a business

AUS920010847US1   21

PATENT
10/081,017

party receiving said call through said callee, an identifier of a device used by said caller, an identifier of a device used by said callee, a location of said caller, a location of said callee, an intended subject matter of said call, a path of said call" and "accessing said selection of third party criteria for regulating said call based on said at least one context identifier in addition to said identity of said caller and said identity of said callee" is provided throughout the specification, and, in particular, at page 28, lines 16-24.

With reference to newly added claim 41, antecedent basis for the elements of "selecting an inferred context for said call, wherein said inferred context comprises a rating level for said call" and "accessing said selection of third party criteria for regulating said call based on said identity of said caller and said identity of said callee and said inferred context" is provided throughout the specification, and, in particular, at page 36, line 13 through page 37, line 12.

With reference to newly added claim 42, antecedent basis for the element of "blocking transfer of at least one from among a caller identity to said callee and said callee identity to said caller as required by said selection of third party criteria" is found throughout the specification, and, in particular, at page 45, lines 9-16.

With reference to newly added claim 43, antecedent basis for the element of "said third party criteria is designated independent of a caller profile accessible for said caller identity and a callee profile accessible for said callee identity" is found throughout the specification, and in particular, in Figures 5-8, as previously described with reference to claims 5 and 6.

AUS920010847US1   22

PATENT
10/081,017

Conclusion

Applicants note the citation of pertinent prior art cited by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment. Further, Applicants reiterate the request for a telephone conference with the Examiner at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

ON 1/4/2005

Amy J. Pattillo
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,983
P.O. Box 161327
Austin, Tx 78716
512.402.9820 [phone]
512.306.0417 [fax]

AUS920010847US1   23